

From: BA5477@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: 4/8/03 3:37PM
Subject: (no subject)

Dear Mr. Copps,

My name is Beth Wasko. I am a 36 year old female who has spent 6 years in the Radio industry for a classic rock radio station in the Youngstown, Ohio market. The first 4 years I was a weekend jock and the last 2 years I was a morning show CO-host. I had a very nice following of listeners who appreciated my input to the show, my views and my voice. I was never written up for disobeying any rules, nor have I received, at any point of my employment, a bad air check. I was released one year ago, without notice, and was not given a reason. Much to my surprise, that action was very acceptable, by law. My program director, Scott Kennedy, basically got tired of me and that was all he needed as a reason to take away my employment. There was absolutely nothing I could do, but try and get another position with the competitor. When I say, The competitor...I mean "The" competitor. As I explained earlier I am in the Youngstown, Ohio market. At one point there were several companies in our area to provide radio personalities job opportunities. Now there are two. Cumulus, where I came from and Clear Channel that has no available positions. In a situation like this, what is someone, like me, to do? I know of other people in this same situation, from this area, and I can't imagine how many others across the states. I am very curious to hear what benefits came from the Telecommunications Act of 1996? The monopoly has decreased jobs, lessened the choice for the consumer to advertise, as well as lessened the choice for the listener. I do see the benefit of a company with a lot of money coming in, buying up the area and having, basically, no competition.

In my situation...I was given an opportunity as a CO-host of a morning show in an area of which I was born and raised and needless to say, know very well. I did an excellent job and was a real asset, however my program director grew tired of me and ended my career, because the only other option in this area had no availability, can someone please explain to me, in this day and time how that situation is American? The other concern with this monopoly theory is how does someone who set out to make a career in this industry better themselves? My one morning show partner is a 40 year old man with 5 kids. He has a very good name in this market with many listeners. He is held captive with a company that loves the sayings: "pay freezes" and "nothing left in the budget." How does this person get ahead...again...how is this American? It is a very discouraging thought to see that the radio industry has come to this. Can someone please help people like us. I am sure if you took a poll of people involved in this industry you would find that the Telecom Act of 96 did nothing but kick people out of this industry, which is a real crime. Again, can someone please explain the benefit. Why is it that the people in the top management positions and the owners are millionaires, and the people out there doing the job and making the radio stations worth listening to can't get the amount of money they are worth or worse yet, a job?

Thank you for your time,
Bethanne Wasko

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Hansen
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Apr 8, 2003 5:12 PM
Subject: We Vote No to Deregulation of Media Ownership Rules

Dear Mr. Powell:

My husband and I are concerned about protecting the diversity of news and information that the American public needs and deserves.

The 1945 Supreme Court decision (*Associated Press v. United States*) maintains that mergers that narrow the dissemination of information are unconstitutional.

The deregulatory effort of the 1990s in the electricity and telecommunications industries has upset this delicate balance between private interest and public responsibilities.

Already we can see that the news divisions of the media cartel appear to work against the public interest -- and for their parent companies, their advertisers and the Bush Administration. The situation is completely un-American. It is the purpose of the press to help us run the state, and not the other way around. As citizens of a democracy, we have the right and obligation to be well aware of what is happening, both in "the homeland" and the wider world. Without such knowledge we cannot be both secure and free. We therefore must take steps to liberate the media from oligopoly, so as to make the government our own.

The long-standing rules on media concentration made sense yesterday, and they make sense today.

A nation of monopolies is not in the best interest of this country.

Kimberly and Rick Hansen

From: Todd Scallions
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 9, 2003 11:52 PM
Subject: Regulation

I just read an article about how the CTIA and Verizon Wireless are going to try and fight the regulation to allow subscribers to keep their telephone numbers when switching carriers. I want you to know, as a consumer, that I want the regulation to go into full effect on November 24 of this year. I believe the FCC has been more than giving by allowing the date to be pushed back three times already. Just wanted you to hear this from a consumer.

Thanks,
Todd Scallions A+ N+

From: Murphy, Richard
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Apr 10, 2003 5:08 PM
Subject: station ownership

Dear Mr. Chairman,

I understand the FCC is considering relaxing the cap on the number radio stations a company can own.

I feel this is a wrong course for Radio. We are seeing the making of a monopoly in Radio broadcasting. At least with the advent of cable and satellite TV, viewers have choice. If one company owns a majority of the radio signals in a market, choice and variety is no longer an option to the radio listener. As a 20 year radio professional I have seen the industry consolidate and the quality and variety of product available to the community dwindle. Relaxing of these rules creates two major problems. 1. Small broadcast companies offering a different product and 2. unemployment.

1. Companies like Clear Channel eliminate any new competition to come to the market. I could open a hardware store today to compete with the one down the street, but because there are no new radio signals signing on. You have to buy what's available. In Denver to buy a decent signal you're looking at 80-120 million dollars, with the idea that Clear Channel owns a majority of Denver radio. Fair competition requires a level playing field. That currently does not exist in sales, and programming. Sales has to compete with Clear Channel saying to an advertiser buy station 1 and we will bonus your commercials on stations 2, 3, and 4. Programming wise Clear Channel says to an artists play a show for one of our competitors and we will pull your music off all Clear Channel stations. Play concert for Clear Channel concerts or we will do the same. Relaxing the rules only makes a playing field favor large companies like Clear Channel even more. Where the mom and pop stations have no opportunity to offer any type of value or quality radio to the listener because of the big bully on the block. These companies realize they won't generate the advertising dollars of a Clear Channel but at least they should have a chance to come into the market and compete.

2. From an internal employment point of view relaxing the owner ship rules will allow companies like Clear Channel to implement their programming philosophy of an Announcer voice tracking multiple markets from one location. I know for a fact that one disc jockey will voice as many a 13 markets a day. 13 communities, cities, stations, with out local broadcasters being able to communicate to their audience. This practice is not only a disservice to the listener but also is contributing to the unemployment of Americans. 12 Announcers out of work and that one announcer that is working is not making the salary of 13 Disc jockeys. They are told to do it or lose your job to some who will.

We are on verge of Radio being controlled by a couple of companies in top 250 markets in the United States. Fair market competition and the employment of broadcast professionals like my self are on the verge of being a casualty of your decision. They days of 20 years ago where 30 stations in Denver owned by 10 -15 owners a thing of the past. tomorrow it could be 30 stations owned by 3 broadcast companies.

Diversity in the number of broadcasters in a market offers variety and

quality programming. The winner is the communities and the listeners served by those stations.

Thank for your time and consideration.

Richard Werry
4268 South Argonne Street
Aurora, CO
80013

From: Guardie204@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Apr 10, 2003 10:36 PM
Subject: Regulations

Hello.

I am a concerned citizen of the United States. Even though this is one e-mail, I speak for many! I was watching NBC Nightly News tonight (Thurs. 4/10/2003) and was appalled at what I saw. What I saw was a camera viewing an incident in Iraq. Soldiers were protecting themselves at a checkpoint and told a vehicle to stop, and the soldiers opened fire on the vehicle. I couldn't BELIEVE that NBC was showing this! What next?? Has human life become so cheap and humdrum that showing people get killed is O.K. now? There are rules in place for such things, and I don't understand why you don't observe them. The FCC needs to do something about this, they need to enforce their regulations, and more importantly, your company needs to follow them. There is a REASON for the rules. Has everyone lost any semblance of common sense? The news is becoming like those reality shows, and those videos, if one remembers, where those videos were so controversial, the ones where people were getting killed. The dehumanization and the inoculation of day in and day out of showing such things devalues the morality of our culture and society. Showing such things desensitizes the minds of many; people think they are watching a movie or something, NOT REAL LIFE! Is this what we want of our future? The only way to change things is to act, and act we must!

The FCC must also. What does the FCC do anymore, surely not protect the public from sexual content and now, extreme violence! The government that governs the FCC needs to enforce the laws, if the FCC will not.

From: Allyn Llyr
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 14, 2003 11:04 PM
Subject: Commercial concentrations of media

To Michael Powell FCC Chair:

The alarming concentration of the media into only a few companies is we feel one of the dangers the FCC should be acting to prevent "in the public interest". The recent coverage of the Iraqi conflict, along with the coverage of recent elections and the overt and covert support by the media of specific political parties is an excellent example of the dangers of concentrating the power of the media in the hands of the few.

As an example of abuses, recently the directors and board members of many of the major news media including "Clear Channel" "Fox News" "MSNBC" and others actively censored coverage of news events in regards to the ongoing discussions concerning the direction America was moving in regards to that most gravest of concerns, life and death, war and peace. These discussions were of the highest political nature, and yet the majority of NEWS available to the American citizenry was more akin to a cheerleading competition, than to an open and thoughtful political debate. Of gravest concern was the restrictions placed upon broadcasters by their corporate owners, that even restricted the types of music broadcast, so as not to support or encourage any peace movement, in that protest songs, or music that portrayed war in any critical manor whatsoever. There were also the termination and character assaults on individuals who spoke out against such policies, and the restriction forbidding NEWS anchors, from discussing or mentioning "non-classified" and common knowledge information in regards to political figures, and events around the world that were not favorable to the political and religious policies supported by the governing board's of directors of many of the NEWS outlets.

The direct censor ship we as American citizens have recently experienced was not for financial gain, nor was it to present a diversity of ideals, but was rather meant to specifically forward a restrictive philosophical and political agenda in an effort to shape public opinion and through the use of misinformation, carefully scripted and crafted use of language, and deliberate false statements. A majority of the currently available NEWS and information sources available on cable, broadcast, print, and radio media are owned and operated by only seven companies, and a majority of those are controlled by groups or individuals that are actively working to support and evangelize a specific political view and ideological viewpoint. In a competitive market this would not be successful, as the people would have choices and market pressure would correct such issues of content through a diversity of owners and ideas. With the current situation it is apparent that market pressures are not sufficient to ensure open and free communication, a diversity of ideas, or the protection of free speech that the FCC is the assigned the task of protecting on our broadcast mediums, and as a result without some form of control or intervention, Freedom of the press, and open access to information will become a thing of the past for the American citizenry.

The further consolidation of our media and programming choices would further exacerbate the issue and would accelerate the trends that have produced the current conditions that have lead to the abuses of power and undue ideological influence currently inundating the public.

Any further removal of restrictions in regard to market diversity is not only a mistake, but given current evidence could only be seen as complicity of purpose to restrict information from the public and further entrench a growing ideological and economic monopoly of the public communications medium as governed and administered by the FCC for the Public, and the Public interest's.

An even more disturbing trend is the attempt to curb and restrict access to international sources of news through legislation and restrictions on access to the Internet and alternative sources of NEWS and entertainment around the world.

Because of all of the events listed, and countless volumes of similar abuses that are taking place every

day throughout our nation, we are appealing to the FCC to act reasonably as the custodian of the Public Communications, to protect and guard our rights, and stop further deregulation of the cable, radio, and broadcast companies. We ask that the FCC role back many of the current and proposed changes that would further deregulate and degrade the Public's access to free and divers forms of information and entertainment sources; also that the FCC add new controls that would be designed to encourage more diversity of thought and communication, rather than less.

For the protection of our nation, and for the freedoms that are guaranteed in the Bill of Rights, more controls to ensure media companies do not stifle political thought, not less are sorely needed. In regards to political advertisement and commentary, recent events have seen massive censorship of differing political, religious, and ideological views by a very small minority of Americans and select foreign interests that happen to have large sources of capital and control a majority of our communications mediums in America.

The lack of any true diversity or dialog available to the Public through our media has lead to comparisons of America's media to that of China, Syria, and the former Soviet Union. Without a true representation of America's diversity in political ideas and the expression of differing religious and philosophical points of view, we are crushing the very Freedom and diversity that has made America great, and that is guaranteed to all Americans through the Bill of Rights.

While it may not currently be a crime to deliberately censor "legal" speech by preventing the airing or broadcast of opposing points of view, or to use financial and political retaliation against those who broadcast any disagreement, perhaps it is time for the FCC to look into regulations that would fine, or restrict such conduct, thereby preventing the small but powerful groups who currently control the majority of media distribution in America, from stifling the very Freedoms that the FCC is tasked with protecting for the Public.

Please support freedom and America by halting and reversing the current trend of deregulation among media outlets in America.

Sincerely
Reverend Allyn Llyr
The Gaian Fellowship

fas-cism n.

A system of government that exercises a dictatorship of the extreme right, typically through the merging of state and business leadership, together with belligerent nationalism.

- The American Heritage Dictionary, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1983

From: Bryan Thompson
Date: Tue, Apr 15, 2003 4:36 PM
Subject: vote against consolidation

Federal Communications Commission

445 12th Street, SW

Washington, DC 20554

Sample FCC Email, Letter or Comment. Also can be used for Congress.

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,

Bryan Thompson

709 Hitchcock, Lisle, IL

60532

(630) 969-6424

From: Greg Ice
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Apr 15, 2003 6:17 PM
Subject: No Media Monopolization at Citizen's Expense

Dear FCC Chairman:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,
Greg Ice

The new MSN 8: smart spam protection and 2 months FREE*
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

From: aztlanj@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 16, 2003 3:26 AM
Subject: Corporate media

WE DEMAND TO GET THE FULL, UNEDITED TRUTH ABOUT WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW AS CITIZENS.

WHAT DO YOU THINK WE ARE?

From: Steve Peery
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 16, 2003 8:06 AM
Subject: Broadcasting Deregulation

Dear Commissioner,

I am aware of the vote scheduled for June 2 on further deregulation of broadcasting ownership. If you vote to deregulate further, I believe it will do enormous damage to the core of our democracy. Putting total control of information dissemination into the hands of a few whose motives are profit, not the public interest is not the best way to foster democracy.

I urge you to put off this vote for at least 12 months so the issue can be studied, so the public can be informed.

If this goes through we will see greater voter apathy and a less informed public. This will be bad for the US and for the world. Please think of what is best for our country and do not allow deregulation.

Thank you.

Steve Peery
Amy Ludwin
Jericho, VT

From: anne@sandstrom.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 16, 2003 9:05 AM
Subject: regulation / de-regulation

Dear Mr. Powell;

I am writing to implore you not to further de-regulate the communications / broadcasting industry. The existence of a diversified media is essential to democracy. Further de-regulation will assure that all news dissemination in this country will be controlled by a few corporations. If anything, the industry need further regulations resulting in breaking up what is fast becoming a communications cartel.

The airwaves belong to the people, not corporations. I urge to to act on the behalf of American citizens, not these few corporations.

Sincerely,
Anne Sandstrom

From: Elizabeth Pennebaker
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 16, 2003 1:09 PM
Subject: I oppose the deregulation of the American media

Dear Chairman Powell,

We are lucky to have an honest and upstanding FCC Commissioner in Michael Copps, who brought the issue of media deregulation to our community's attention during a recent Town Meeting in Vermont.

I strongly oppose the deregulation of the American media, because I feel that such deregulation will strangle the diversity that is fundamental to the exercise of free speech from all sectors of our society on the US airwaves.

Please take more time to review the upcoming deregulation proposals and act to ensure the continued local control and diversity of our media.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Elizabeth Pennebaker
Westford, VT

From: Beverly Gibson
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 1:43 PM
Subject: Stop deregulation of Media Coverage

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Respectfully,

Beverly L Gibson

Stanwood, MI 49346

From: Gordon Giles
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Apr 18, 2003 9:05 PM
Subject: Don't allow monopoly of media channels

Dear Commissioner Powell:

Numerous reports agree that the Federal Communications is planning to loosen longstanding rules governing control of the media that bring news and views to the American public. This will inevitably lead to monopoly, by a few large corporate giants, of TV stations, newspapers, and broadcast networks.

I urge you, Commissioner Powell, to halt immediately any implementation of these these FCC plans that threaten public access to diverse views and information.

Sincerely,

Gordon Giles
2853 E. Cobre Dr.
Phoenix, AZ 85028
Linda Brewster, Ph.D.
2853 E. Cobre Dr.
Phoenix, AZ 85028

From: Eric Fanning
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:48 AM
Subject: No further deregulation

SUBJECT:
Upcoming meeting to ease regulations on media ownership

Please reconsider any weakening of the already famished regulations the FCC has toward broadcast and media outlet ownership.

Over the past few years since the last loosening of rules the US media consumer has received a more and more homogenized vision of news corresponding more with the huge wealthy corporations that own the media outlets than with the truth.

You may or may not agree but I and many others, who care, have to find other outlets, be they foreign or listener sponsored, to find out the entire picture of what is going on in the world today.

If we want better "entertainment" from media or advertising of products supported by the owners of media conglomerates, easing regulations is the right direction but as it is, news coverage has gotten perilously close to being a corporate, and with this administration in office now, governmental media machine.

At your meeting I suggest you discuss ways to widen the ownership of smaller, listener sponsored stations and media outlets and find ways to regulate the "entertainment" money out of media owned news so a fair and balanced reporting of current events can be found at all stations and in all newspapers in the US unless specifically labeled entertainment.

This is America and it is supposed to be of the people for the people not of the corporation for the corporation.

Eric Fanning
Whittier CA

From: Robin and Karen
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:53 AM
Subject: We oppose the proposed media deregulation...

Dear FCC Commissioners,

Please hold hearings on the proposed changes in the media regulations. We oppose the proposed deregulation of the media. We need to strengthen our media ownership rules.

Sincerely,
Karen M. Johnson
Robin L. Kristy

CC: KM KJMWEB

From: Jack Powers
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 1:48 PM
Subject: supportive of change - for less media concentration, not more.

I am supportive of change - for less media concentration, not more.

Jack Powers
Powers Technical Services jack@cryptnet.org +1-408/621-1883
Suite 297, 305 Vineyard Town Center, Morgan Hill, CA 95037 USA

From: Christy S
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 3:06 PM
Subject: Stop the monopoly of airwaves

I urge to vote against on June 2 against further deregulation of media ownership in any medium. Indeed, urge a return to the pre 1996 rules so that Americans can reasonably trust we are getting sufficient exposure to the information needed to efficiently regulate our government. What we are getting now is increasingly propagandized in line with White House policies as the defense contractors own the networks brainwashing the public into accepting war that enriches the companies in the White House. It propagates a vicious circle.

Christy Sweet 2212 Staples Av Key West Fl. 33040

From: GregLylari@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 3:22 PM
Subject: Down with deregulations!

Attention: Chairman M. Powell, Commissioner K. Martin

I vehemently oppose the proposed deregulation of the media. Instead, we **MUST** strengthen our media ownership rules!

The Commerce Committees **MUST** hold public hearings on the proposed changes in these regulations immediately.

I saw a report on the deregulation of the media on PBS. In it Mr. Powell made it appear that public input was not that important. It isn't true: Americans deserve to have their say!

Amy Valent-Ribot
Hoboken, NJ
greglyari@aol.com

CC: kimweb@fcc.gov

From: KAAREN Donnelly
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Apr 23, 2003 3:24 AM
Subject: Halt & Reverse further Media Consolidation & REINSTATE FAIRNESS Doctrine

Dear Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein:

Halt & Reverse further Media Consolidation
& REINSTATE FAIRNESS Doctrine

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,
Kaaren Donnelly

Contacting Commisioners:

Chairman Michael K. Powell: mpowell@fcc.gov

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy: kabernat@fcc.gov

Commissioner Michael J. Copps: mcopps@fcc.gov

Commissioner Kevin J. Martin: kjmweb@fcc.gov

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein: jadelste@fcc.gov

at:
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Tired of spam? Get advanced junk mail protection with MSN 8.
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

From: bradstuff@cox.net
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 23, 2003 12:02 PM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Brad Sargent
394 E Glaucus St
Encinitas, California 92024

From: amie_hanson@attbi.com
To: wkennard@fcc.gov
Date: Wed, Apr 23, 2003 2:54 PM
Subject: Consolidation of Media Ownership

I live in Seattle, an area that, as diverse and lively as the music and political scenes are, has little diversity in available radio stations. Four companies own nearly 85% of the stations. I am constantly disappointed in the fact that much of the regional music has little representation on local stations. In fact, almost none except for the independent station KEXP.

Since the public owns the airwaves, it is disappointing to see that so few benefit from their use. With fewer companies owning our airwaves, fewer ideas and artists are broadcast. Generally, those which already have appeal on a national level are played ad nauseum. Fewer voices are heard and, therefore, fewer opinions. I recently thought of this when the author of the song "War" died. Regardless of someone's opinions on war (in general) or recent events, it is evident that such a song would not receive airplay today. I also wonder if Bob Dylan or other politically active musicians from the past would have the standing they do today if radio stations had the consolidated ownership they have now. Additionally, I have heard few stories covering this issue on the radio and understand that some news shows have not presented information on your review of regulations because they feel that it is not in the interest of company owners. A story which IS of interest to the public.

I think that we deserve to have a diverse media, not only radio. Without multiple voices and perspectives being provided to the public, our information becomes severely limited. Please do not relax regulations on ownership of television and radio stations.

I appreciate your time.

Sincerely,
Amie Hanson

Telephone: 206.985.0082
Address 8015 California Ave SW, Seattle WA 98136

CC: sness@fcc.gov, hfurchtg@fcc.gov, mpowell@fcc.gov, gtristan@fcc.gov